

HOMEMAKER SERVICE DEMONSTRATION TRAINING PROJECT

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

by

MURIEL ELAINE ZIMMERMAN

B.S., McPherson College, 1964

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Approved by:

---

Major Professor

LD  
2668  
TH  
1969  
Z555  
C.2

Al1208 321524

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project Described . .	1
Objectives . . . . .	4
Definitions . . . . .	4
Review of Related Work . . . . .	6
PROCEDURES . . . . .	9
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	10
Profile of Trainees . . . . .	11
Professional Development . . . . .	16
Salary . . . . .	16
Future Advancement . . . . .	19
Preparation to Get and Hold a Job . . . . .	20
Community Understanding . . . . .	22
Job Understanding . . . . .	23
Status and Dignity . . . . .	25
Personal Development . . . . .	29
Developing Self Confidence . . . . .	29
Enriching Background of Trainee . . . . .	31
Group Living . . . . .	31
Other Experiences . . . . .	32
Developing Insights and Desirable Attitudes . . . . .	33
Drawing Conclusions and Summarizing Important Ideas. . . . .	35
Developing Other Personal Qualities. . . . .	35
Subject Matter Achievement . . . . .	43
Working with and Understanding People . . . . .	44
Developing Proficiency in Household Skills . . . . .	44
Planning and Preparing Food for Families . . . . .	44
Developing Skills . . . . .	53
Summary . . . . .	56

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	59
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	61
LITERATURE CITED . . . . .	62
APPENDICES . . . . .	64
Appendix A - Rating Scale for Interviews and Questionnaires .	65
Appendix B - Interview Schedule with Trainees . . . . .	66
Appendix C - Interview Schedule with Supervisor . . . . .	74
Appendix D - Interview Schedule with Client . . . . .	80
Appendix E - Staff Evaluation of Effect of the Training Program on the Trainee. . . . .	83
Appendix F - Profile of Trainees by Training Session . . . . .	88
Appendix G - Homemaker Service Demonstration Project - Kansas State University Question/Answer Sheet . . . . .	90

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Profile of trainees . . . . .	11
2. Job status before and after training . . . . .	15
3. Trainee attitude towards salary of homemaker . . . . .	17
4. Supervisor evaluation of effect of salary on trainee . . . . .	18
5. Trainee evaluation of effect of training program on her future . . . . .	19
6. Staff and supervisor evaluation of effect of training on trainee's preparation to get and hold a job. . . . .	21
7. Staff and supervisor evaluation of effect of training on trainee's understanding of community relationships . . . . .	22
8. Trainee evaluation of job understanding of homemakers . . . . .	24
9. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's job understanding . . . . .	25
10. Trainee evaluation of status and dignity involved in working as a homemaker. . . . .	26
11. Staff and supervisor evaluation of sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that trainee is able to render to families . . . . .	27
12. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service . . . . .	28
13. Trainee, staff, and supervisor evaluation of trainee's self confidence . . . . .	30
14. Staff evaluation of effect of group living on trainees. . . . .	32
15. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's acceptable attitudes . . . . .	34
16. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's initiative and judgment . . . . .	36
17. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's recognition of limits of her responsibility . . . . .	37
18. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's working cooperatively with family members . . . . .	38
19. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's sharing observations and problems with those responsible . . . . .	39

20. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's assuming the role appropriate of a homemaker . . . . .	40
21. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's courteousness, friendliness and tact . . . . .	41
22. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's good personal habits . . . . .	42
23. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's understanding and use of elementary techniques for working with people . . . . .	45
24. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's understanding of some characteristics of families . . . . .	46
25. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's demonstration of knowledge of basic homemaking techniques . . . . .	47
26. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's practicing of safe work habits . . . . .	48
27. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's demonstration of proper use of common household appliances . . . . .	49
28. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's keeping the home clean and orderly . . . . .	50
29. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's practicing of good shopping procedures . . . . .	51
30. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's planning and preparation of nutritious family meals . . . . .	52
31. Skill each trainee thought she developed most during training. . . . .	54
32. Trainee, staff and supervisor evaluation of which had a greater effect on trainees -- subject matter achievement or personal development . . . . .	54
33. Trainee evaluation of which lessons were most helpful. . . . .	55
34. Trainee evaluation of which lessons were least helpful . . . . .	56
35. Profile of trainees by training session . . . . .	88

## INTRODUCTION

### Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project Described

The Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project was inaugurated at Kansas State University on March 15, 1968, under contract with the United States Department of Labor and the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Funds were authorized from Title I (Experimental and Demonstration Projects) and Title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (PL87-415). The KSU project was one of seven demonstration projects in a national pilot program arranged through the National Committee on Household Employment to train more than 800 workers, and to develop, promote and elevate the status of household related services (U.S. Department of Labor, 1968). During the first year of the KSU project thirty five homemakers were trained in seven training sessions. They are the subject of this thesis.

Basic objectives of the project were as stated in the Training Program Guide of the KSU Homemaker Service Demonstration Project Proposal incorporated in the contracts. They were to develop a training program for homemaker services that would:

- (1) establish an expectation of high quality performance and standards for all who care for the aging and other families,
- (2) provide a nucleus of trained homemakers to meet the needs of families, including the aged, during periods of stress,
- (3) develop through experimentation a prototype training program adaptable to junior and state colleges in Kansas and other states,
- (4) ultimately relieve the center of training homemakers so it can concentrate on preparing professionally trained staff for other training centers.

Need for training was recognized as the next step in the development of homemaker services in Kansas by the leadership of the Department of Family Economics and supported by the Kansas Home Economics Association and the Kansas Citizen's Council on Aging, Inc. Previous research had

determined such a sufficient demand for homemaker services in Kansas that the State Board of Social Welfare recognized homemaker service as a social service and established a Civil Service classification for homemaker.

The training program was designed to train homemakers who could reflect such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service. The overriding objectives of the project were to encourage communities to recognize this as a service which offers a new career for women, thus giving women new opportunities to use their talents gainfully and serve the needs of others.

Trainees qualifying for the project were preferably above age 35, and particularly age 45 to 65. This age was selected to reach those who had passed through the child rearing stage of family responsibility and were ready to return to or enter gainful employment. One other characteristic of this generation of women is their handicap of low formal educational attainment. Over one-third of the women in this age group have not had above an eighth grade education (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1966, Table 1).

This generation of mature women have a high potential for working as homemakers. They have a background of homemaking skills, but need refresher courses and training in home management and personal care to find jobs in the area of household employment. Many are untrained, underemployed or unemployed, and are involved in activities which lack status or do not give them a feeling of personal worth. They generally do not find jobs other than menial non-professional jobs available.

Any woman who indicated and gave assurance that she expected to work in a full-time capacity as a homemaker (as defined by the Homemaker Services Report on the 1959 Conference, 1960, p. xii) was eligible to apply for this training. The experimental and demonstration features of the project allowed younger women to apply, but priority was given to applicants above age 35.

The innovative feature of the Homemaker Training Project was the specialized residential group training in a teaching-laboratory situation located at Ula Dow. This is one of three home management residences on Kansas State University campus, immediately north of Justin Hall, which is the center for teaching and research for the College of Home Economics at Kansas State University. The twenty-four hour involvement of living in a home-like atmosphere with other trainees allowed for learning situations through lessons, managing and caring for the house and personal aspects

of group living. This provided a unique opportunity for instruction in a most critical ingredient of homemaker service, that of providing personal care and understanding of others. The close proximity to Justin Hall provided convenient access to classrooms and laboratories.

Training was directed through a three-step procedure: (1) lecture, (2) demonstration and practical application, and (3) evaluation. Classes were taught by as many as twenty five professional staff members comprising subject matter specialists from the Cooperative Extension Service, faculty members from the College of Home Economics, personnel from local businesses and staff from community social agencies.

Other learning experiences included field trips, films, tapes, group discussions, role playing and readings, scheduled and supervised by the teaching coordinator. Training in performance skills was not the major focus of the training. Skills were not repeated until a standard level of performance was achieved; they were incorporated if there were new techniques to be introduced or if they related to management. Training in management and personal care were stressed. Informal, individual and group counseling and daily and weekly evaluations were continuous parts of the training program.

Each training session was for a maximum of nine women. It included two weeks of in-resident training, followed by a week of field experience with an agency providing homemaker service, and a fourth week of additional in-resident training.

Two general objectives of the Homemaker Training Project were:

- (1) to help the trainee develop the necessary skills, personal qualities, and understandings to enable her to assume full or partial responsibility of managing a home and/or assisting a family in periods of stress or crisis.
- (2) to help the trainee develop the feeling that as a Homemaker she is an individual of worth, that she can feel a sense of pride and dignity in the services that she is able to render to families.

Additional information concerning the project is available in the Interim Report of the Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project, Phase I, (1969) on loan from Farrell Library, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.



## Objective

A follow-up evaluation on each trainee was considered so essential that it was incorporated into the project. Its purpose was to help determine if the training program had an effect on the trainees and to identify the contributing factors. Also it was conducted to learn if trainees reflected a sufficiently high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service, and if women were able to meet the variety of needs families experience during periods of crisis.

The specific objective of this study was to determine the effects of the training on the professional development, personal development or subject matter achievement of the trainee, as observed by the trainees, trainers, supervisors and employers. Inferentially, a secondary objective was to evaluate the evaluation instruments.

## Definitions

The kinds of services provided by the employed homemaker depend on the type of agency, its policies and purposes, source of funds, as well as the needs of the family or individual. Moore (1965, pp. 52-55) described three major concepts of homemaker service: Home Management Aid Program, Homemaker and Personal Care Services and Homemaker Services for Children.

The following definitions of homemaker, homemaker service and homemaker-home health aide are recognized as authoritative for purposes of this thesis:

A "homemaker" is a mature, specially trained woman with skills in homemaking who is employed by a public or voluntary health or welfare agency to help maintain and preserve family life that is threatened with disruption by illness, death, ignorance, social maladjustment, or other problems. A pleasant personality, physical and mental well-being, experience and training enable her to assume full or partial responsibility for child or adult care, for household management and for maintaining a wholesome atmosphere in the home. She does these things under the general supervision of a social worker, nurse, or other appropriate professional person connected with the sponsoring agency. She exercises initiative and judgment in the performance of her duties, recognizes the limits of her responsibility, works cooperatively with family members, and shares her observations and problems with those responsible for the homemaker service program.

"Homemaker service" is a community service sponsored by a public or voluntary health or welfare agency that employs personnel to furnish home help services to families with children; to convalescent, aged, acutely or chronically ill, and disabled persons; or to all of these. Its primary function is the maintenance of household routine and the preservation or creation of wholesome family living in times of stress. Because homemaker services should be offered on the basis of a social diagnosis and often a medical diagnosis as well, trained professional persons should evaluate the type of service needed and the length of time it should be given. (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1960, p. xii).

The above definitions were formulated at the 1959 National Conference on Homemaker Services. In July, 1965, the National Council for Homemaker Service accepted the following definition of Homemaker-Home Health Aide Services:

Homemaker-Home Health Aide Service is an organized community program provided through a public or voluntary non-profit agency. Qualified persons--homemaker-home health aides--are employed, trained, and assigned by this agency to help maintain, strengthen, and safeguard the care of children and the functioning of dependent, physically or emotionally ill or handicapped children and adults in their own homes where no responsible person is available for this purpose. The appropriate professional staff of the agency establishes with applicants their need for the service, develops a suitable plan to meet it, assigns and supervises the homemaker-home health aides and continually evaluates whether the help given meets the diagnosed need of its recipients. (National Council for Homemaker Service, 1965, p. 5).

Homemaker-home health aide as described in a recent Public Health Service publication (U.S. Department of Labor, 1969) confirms continuance of the trend to merge these two into one service. An ad hoc committee composed of representatives of the State Department of Social Welfare, State Board of Health, State Board of Vocational Education, Visiting Nurses Association, public health nurses, and homemaker supervisors of Kansas in a meeting on June 26, 1969, accepted the functions of homemaker-home health aides as described in the publication and expressed agreement that the training program of the Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project, with the additional topics recently included under personal services, met the requirements for training homemaker-home health aides in Kansas.

## Review of Related Work

An extensive review was made of literature about other homemaker service programs to determine what evaluation methods and instruments had been used and how they had been analyzed.

The evaluation process should be a continuous and integral part of the training program, according to "Visiting Homemaker: A Suggested Training Program" (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1964, p. 11). Furthermore, the major functions of evaluation in a program designed to prepare individuals for wage earning should include:

- (1) assessing basic abilities of persons desiring to enroll in the training program as a basis for selection,
- (2) determining needs and backgrounds of trainees as one basis of setting up goals for the course,
- (3) measuring the extent to which trainees achieve these goals.

Also, evaluation made for these purposes will give results which the teacher can use as a basis for developing learning experiences, modifying course plans, and selecting appropriate references and teaching materials.

Various evaluation devices are suggested as necessary for the teacher to accumulate objective information about the growth of the trainee. These include anecdotal records, individual conferences, check lists and rating scales to compile evidence of trainee accomplishments throughout the training course.

The home economists of the Federal Extension Service (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1965, pp. 31-33) recommended that built in evaluation should be planned before teaching or training. Before and after questionnaires to evaluate adoption of practices as well as of knowledge will set a benchmark and reveal changes. Evaluation of long-term progress after six or eight months or a year will show or prove some results of training. Evidence of progress may be collected by actual visits to homes, through reports of the program assistants, or in other ways. Results may be measured by example or by numbers, or both.

Criteria for evaluating trainees reflect the mission of the agencies. For a trainee to be employed as a Visiting Homemaker, the criteria will be more intangible than for some other occupations (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1964, pp. 13-14). These include understanding of

human frailties and needs, and some insight into how to provide the various services required by families under stress. These criteria, thus, assume the training to include development and strengthening of: Personal qualities, including courtesy, friendliness, and tact; acceptable appearance; good personal habits; mature judgment; acceptable attitudes; ability to assume the role appropriate for the homemaker.

A well-qualified Visiting Homemaker should also be able to perform activities knowledgeably and skillfully. She works effectively under supervision; demonstrates knowledge of basic homemaking techniques, carries out directions; practices good shopping procedures; plans and prepares nutritious family meals; understands and uses elementary techniques for working with people; practices safe work habits; knows which people to contact in an emergency; demonstrates proper use of common household appliances; demonstrates acceptable methods of care and storage of clothing; understands some characteristics of families; and keeps the home clean and orderly.

In 1965, the National Council for Homemaker Service combined the terms 'homemaker' and 'home health aide' to provide a broad range of services designated to offset or prevent the breakdown of a family (National Council for Homemaker Service, 1967, pp. 16-17). It emphasizes not only need for practical skills in housekeeping, household management and good health practices, but more important needs for psychological insight into people, their motivations and aspirations, their individual and intricate relationships within and outside the family.

Although specific criteria were not given, general criterion for evaluating the trainee and her competence in carrying out tasks required of a homemaker were presented. To assure learning that leads towards these competencies, the instructor must check attitudes and interests, comprehension, and the need for additional instruction, which can be effectively appraised by asking aides to state principles, and the conclusions they have drawn from these principles, in their own words.

Information sought and obtained from persons actually engaged in training programs supported the need to integrate training with evaluation. Droscher (1964) agreed that thought must be given to homemaker training programs to the end that its instruction, content and preparation will be inspirational to the trainees, giving them the fullest preparation for service and lending professionalism to their training experiences.

Greenberg (1968) explained in a letter that the Training Center for Comprehensive Care of Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, where personal interviews were conducted with the trainees both during classroom situations and on-the-job period for complete evaluation of home health aides they trained. Although Greenberg sent an interview schedule, she mentioned no system for using this measurement.

Specian (1969, p. 348) stated the ultimate objective of the homemaker aide training program for the Philadelphia County Department of Public Welfare was to help women become self-sufficient and instill in them a desire to evaluate themselves and their own performances, thus helping them to become productive members of society. Evaluations were held throughout the training, and a final interview was held with each individual homemaker before she was placed on her new job. The purpose of the interview was to gain some feedback on what the homemakers felt about their training course, how they saw themselves change during the program and what they expected to do in the future in the way of continued improvement. A follow up evaluation was also held to determine ways in which the training was helpful to the homemakers in their work. No further description of evaluation measurements were included in this literature.

Although the above and other sources supported the importance of evaluations in training programs, the methods, devices or criteria used were inadequately described.

Howell (1962), the State of Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (1965), North Carolina Department of Public Welfare (1961) and the Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis (1966) gave suggestions and criteria for training programs but did not include evaluation techniques.

Burford (1962) in evaluating a course taught at the School of Social Work at the University of Illinois that emphasized the human relations aspect of Homemaker Service said:

The prime value of the course lay in the homemakers' changing attitudes towards their own human relations...homemakers gave evidence of increase in empathy even towards clients of whom they disapproved. Additional perspectives on human behavior were gained through recognition that there are reasons and explanations for clients actions...that knowledgable approaches were open to them.

Homemakers demonstrated motivation and interest in deepening their understanding of their client group and a readiness to use resources of the agency caseworker and supervisor in fuller exploration of significance of behavior in each particular case.

In conclusion, the review of related work supports the recognition of the need for evaluation devices to measure the extent to which trainees reach the goals of training programs. Various techniques for different stages of the training and after graduation are recommended, but no specific instruments for measuring growths and competencies were adequately described. Thus, such devices as were used in the Kansas State University homemaker training program had to be developed by this program; they have not had the benefit of previous use and research.

#### PROCEDURE

Evaluative instruments used to determine the effect of the training program utilized both objective measurements (a profile of trainees) and subjective measurements (interview schedules and rating scales). Media included questionnaires, tape recordings and personal interviews. Measurements were obtained before training, at the end of training and two to four months following graduation. Contacts were made with trainees, their supervisors and employers when possible and staff members of the training program.

A profile of the trainees was developed to determine their background and characteristics. Information was compiled from data obtained by the employment office counselors during the application interviews and from follow up interviews with the trainees by the program coordinator.

Individual factors recorded that were considered to have influenced the effect of the training program on the trainees included: age, race, previous education, marital status, number of dependents, ages of dependents, head of household, financial situation prior to the training, previous job training, job status before the training, and job status after the training..

Subjective measurements involved the use of instruments to obtain information through recall and observation by the trainee, by those in a supervisory capacity, the project staff, and clients with whom the homemakers worked. The types of instruments used included interview schedules and questionnaires.

(1) Each trainee was interviewed by the program coordinator two to four months after she completed the training program as a follow-up procedure to determine the effect of the training program on the trainees. Time for the interview was scheduled through the agency with whom the homemaker was



working. If the trainee was self-employed as a homemaker, employed in work other than as a homemaker, or unemployed, the program coordinator set up an appointment with her in her home community at her convenience.

The eight page schedule in Appendix B was used. Information requested included the trainee's attitudes and reactions before she took the training, at the end of the training session, and two to four months after graduation. Questions were in three main categories: professional development, personal development, and subject matter achievement. The interview was tape recorded for later study. The trainees had completed written and taped evaluations of the lessons and ranked the value of each lesson on a 1-10 scale during the training sessions. Thus, they were familiar with the types of questions and rating scale included in the interview. This rating scale is in Appendix A.

(2) The interview schedule, in Appendix C, was used by the program coordinator with the supervisor of the employing agency. The purpose was to determine if the supervisor believed the training program had an effect on the trainee based on her on-the-job performance. This interview schedule was similar to the one used with the trainee so the answers could be compared.

(3) If the trainee was employed by a private employer after graduation, the program coordinator would have interviewed the person who supervised her employment, using the interview schedule in Appendix D. The same schedule was used with the homemaker supervisors who employed homemakers after graduation, but did not know the trainees previously.

(4) The teaching assistant and the program coordinator of the project staff completed the form in Appendix E to register what effect they believed the training program had on the trainee.

All data were tabulated by trainees and summarized by training sessions.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The profile of trainees is presented to give an overview of the trainees. This is followed by a presentation of opinions of trainees, supervisors, and staff regarding the professional development, personal development and subject matter achievement of trainees.

# Profile of Trainees

The typical trainee was over age 45, Caucasian, a high school graduate, had some previous job training, was married with no dependents and was head of household (Table 1). She was either self supporting or supplementing family income and often underemployed. Prior to training she was not employed in a wage earning activity or was not employed as a homemaker. After training she was gainfully employed and most frequently as a homemaker.

Table 1. Profile of trainees<sup>a</sup>

Age	
<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Under 35 . . . . .	1
35-45 . . . . .	3
45-60 . . . . .	21
Over 60 . . . . .	10

Race	
<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Caucasian. . . . .	28
Negro . . . . .	7

Previous education	
<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Less than 8th grade. . . . .	0
8th grade . . . . .	8
9th grade . . . . .	4
10th grade . . . . .	0
11th grade . . . . .	1
12th grade . . . . .	19
Some college . . . . .	3
College graduate . . . . .	0



## Previous job training -

<u>All</u>	<u>17</u>
Vocational school . . . . .	1
Telephone company . . . . .	1
Beauty college . . . . .	3
Nurses training . . . . .	1
Nurses aide . . . . .	4
Psychiatric aide . . . . .	2
Practical nursing . . . . .	2
Real estate . . . . .	1
Friendly Visitors . . . . .	2

## Marital status

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Married . . . . .	15
Widowed . . . . .	12
Single . . . . .	3
Separated . . . . .	2
Divorced . . . . .	3

## Dependent youths

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
None . . . . .	26
One . . . . .	5
Two . . . . .	1
Three . . . . .	0
Four of more . . . . .	3

## Ages of dependents

<u>All dependent youths</u>	<u>21</u>
Under 1 years of age . . . . .	0
1 to 5 years of age . . . . .	2
6 to 10 years of age . . . . .	2
11 to 15 years of age . . . . .	7
16 to 21 years of age . . . . .	10

## Head of household

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Yes . . . . .	20
No . . . . .	15

## Financial situation prior to training

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Self supporting . . . . .	19*
Main wage earner for family . . . . .	3
Supplementing family income . . . . .	12
Welfare . . . . .	1

\*. Welfare providing medical assistance for one trainee in each category.

## Job status before training

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Homemaker with agency . . . . .	4
Homemaker on own . . . . .	3
Employed - not as a homemaker . . . . .	12
Unemployed . . . . .	16

## Job status after training

<u>All</u>	<u>35</u>
Homemaker with agency . . . . .	10
Homemaker on own . . . . .	5
Employed - not as a homemaker . . . . .	14
Unemployed . . . . .	6

---

<sup>a</sup>See Appendix F for Tables giving profiles by training sessions.

The predominant age group was 45-60 because this was the target age group. Trainees within this age group benefited most from such training because they had experienced raising their own families, were interested in working with people and realized the necessity for training and certification to obtain gainful employment. The experimental and demonstration features of the project allowed acceptance of four younger and ten older trainees than these ages.

Twenty percent of the trainees were Negro even though the Negro female population within this age group comprises only four per cent of the total female population in Kansas (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960; Table 16). The seven Negroes were enrolled in five of the seven classes, a new experience in group living for nearly all trainees.

Most trainees exceeded the median number of 9 years of education for Kansas women in this age group (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960, Table 103). There were no educational requirements to participate in the training program. Women, who because of their age were limited in formal educational attainment, felt privileged and proud they could take advantage of the formalized training program on a college campus and receive certification.

Although nearly half of the trainees had some previous job training, this training was usually taken some time ago. Miscellaneous comments made by trainees during the application procedure and not shown in the profile tables suggests that work they were trained for was not available in their area or work they had been doing was too demanding physically. They wanted to work with people, and recognized the need for additional training and certification to find such gainful employment.

The application procedure screened out many who were really not interested in taking training. Subsistence and training allowances were an incentive for others. This meant that all could take advantage of the educational opportunity at little or no personal cost to the trainee.

The majority of the trainees were within the target stage-in-family-life cycle group of having raised their own families. However nine of the trainees had twenty-one dependents and nearly half of these dependents were ages 16-21. Trainees with young dependents made child care arrangements with friends, relatives and babysitters before taking the training. The three single trainees who had not raised families were persons who had worked with people recently as homemakers on their own or as a nurses' aide.

Although fifteen trainees were not head of households, most felt the need to assist their family. They had educational goals for their dependents which required income supplement, or health conditions of family members and the employment status of the husband made it essential for trainees to find employment to supplement family income or be the main wage earner for the family. Those partially or completely on welfare had inadequate training to be completely self supporting. Through training and certification, trainees hoped to find employment with increased salary to meet financial needs for their situations.

Many trainees were unemployed or underemployed, and those employed lacked status and dignity and had low feelings of personal worth. Many had concluded that desirable jobs were non-existent for them.

Most of the trainees found employment following training (Table 2). All trainees indicated they would work as a homemaker for an agency if such employment were available. The limited number of agencies providing homemaker service limited the number of employment opportunities. Rather than work as a homemaker on their own, some trainees preferred to work in related jobs or return to previous jobs where salary and working conditions were guaranteed.

Table 2. Job status before and after training

	Before training	After training			
		Employed		Unemployed	
		Not as home- maker	As homemaker In agency	On own	
All	<u>35</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Unemployed	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Employed	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Not as homemaker	12	8 <sup>a</sup>	2	0	2
As homemaker	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
In agency	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
On own	3	1	0	2	0

<sup>a</sup> Five returned to previous jobs.

The six trainees who were unemployed after training had health problems, were unable to obtain employment as a homemaker with an agency, or were too involved with family and volunteer activities. Thus, they serve as a reserve of trained homemakers when homemaker service is established in their community.

In the opinion of the staff, and not as a result of statistical analysis, the trainees' race, previous job training, number or age of dependents, financial status or marital status did not have a significant effect on how much trainees benefited from the training program.

Most of the training sessions were not filled to capacity, allowing admission to most women who completed the application process. Undesirable applicants were screened out by the local employment office. Others dropped out for lack of sufficient interest to take the various steps required between

the time they expressed an interest and the time they arrived at Ula Dow Training Center. Thus, achievement of the target group for training was not as a direct result of screening applicants by employment service offices or the admissions committee of the Homemaker Service Training Program, but as a result of "self selectivity".

Results of aptitude tests given some applicants at the employment service offices were not available, and no such tests were given at the training center. Thus, this information cannot be included in the profile of trainees.

### Professional Development

Factors that had an effect on the professional development of trainees included their attitudes and reactions regarding the salary they would receive as a homemaker, the effect the training would have on their personal lives, their understanding of the job of a homemaker, how well prepared they felt to get and hold a job, their understanding of community relationships, and the status and dignity of the profession.

### Salary

When interviewed after training most of the trainees said that prior to training they had not considered what salary they might receive working as a homemaker. This was particularly true of those who had been employed before training or did not have to find gainful employment immediately after training. Thus, salary had little or no effect on twenty-five of the thirty-two women before taking the training (Table 3). What concept they did have was probably from reading the salary section of the Question/Answer Sheet (Appendix G) which was sent to each prospective trainee, or from whatever information was given to them by supervisors or employment service office counselors.

By the end of training, however, they thought salary, as explained to them during the training was a motivating factor in their considering to seek employment as a homemaker. The five women who rated salary as "average" or below had received higher wages at previous jobs or felt the salary was too low for what was expected of a homemaker.

In the follow up interview after training these same five women felt the same way towards salary as they did at the end of training.

Table 3. Trainee attitude towards salary of homemaker

Trainees	Rating of trainees <sup>a</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Graduates</u>							
Before training	4	1	2	1	24	32 <sup>b</sup>	8.0
End of training	12	15	3	2	.	32	3.2
After training	8	8	3	3	.	22 <sup>c</sup>	3.6
<u>Employed after training</u>							
Before training	4	1	2	1	14	22	7.3
End of training	10	7	3	2	.	22	3.2
After training	8	8	3	3	.	22	3.6
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	.	1	3	4	9.0
End of training	3	1	1	1	.	4	3.0
After training	3	.	.	1	.	4	3.0

<sup>a</sup> See Appendix A for scale.

<sup>b</sup> Only 32 of the 35 trainees were available for follow up interviews.

<sup>c</sup> Ten of the trainees were employed elsewhere or were unemployed after training and did not rate their attitudes concerning salary.

Ten trainees did not rate how they felt about salary after graduation. Five of these were still unemployed and five were employed elsewhere because they refused to work at low wages offered them by private employers. Several had quit homemaker jobs since graduation because employers would not pay transportation expenses or adequate salaries. These trainees felt working as a homemaker was not sufficiently rewarding financially. They were among the twenty-four who at the beginning had said that salary had no effect on their taking the training.

The second part of the table is presented in order to eliminate the ten not employed as a homemaker or not employed at all to get a comparability among those who rated their attitudes before, at the end, and after training.

Four trainees lowered their ratings after training. Even though they were employed part or full time they had become discouraged over not receiving better wages as a result of training and felt they were underpaid for what they were expected to do. There is no minimum wage for homemaker.

The last part of the table presents data obtained from the four trainees already employed as homemakers for an agency to see if they were comparable to

other employed trainees. One trainee was already employed on a civil service classification and received her regular monthly salary during the training session. The other trainees were "on leave" from their jobs during the training and knew that upon returning they would receive at least the wages they had made prior to training. This is why they felt salary had no effect on their taking the training. Those working for private agencies believed they should receive higher wages because they were now trained for their job and these wages should be more comparable to that paid by Kansas county welfare offices to homemakers employed under civil service classifications.

The mean scores are included in each table for convenience of readers who are accustomed to looking at mean values. Since they have not been subjected to statistical analysis no interpretation has been made.

Supervisors also rated what effect they felt salary had on the trainee. The supervisors' ratings also indicate they felt trainees to consider salary more important after training (Table 4). This was true of agency homemaker trainees as well as others.

Table 4. Supervisor evaluation of effect of salary on trainee

Trainees <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	3	4	.	6	14	6.5
After training	1	7	2	1	3	14	5.2
After only	.	2	.	.	.	2	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	.	.	4	4	9.5
After training	.	1	1	.	2	4	7.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> One homemaker supervisor did not discuss salary with the trainee.

Clearly one of the results of training is that supervisors became more aware of the fact that training develops expectations of higher salaries for trainees. This may affect attitudes towards sending employees to training sessions. Pragmatic supervisors may need to balance benefits of more effective workers as a result of training versus the expectation of higher salary than

the agencies can afford to pay. Training may result in both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

In their comments following the ratings both trainees and supervisors indicated that salary was of more importance for those who were head of household, self supporting or main wage earners. Even though women wanted jobs that had personal satisfactions and other benefits, the pay check was the main reason for working. Those who were previously unemployed, had no or limited previous job training and were limited in formal educational experiences felt the training would help them overcome educational barriers and they could expect to receive the proposed salary.

#### Future advancement

Trainees were asked what their thoughts were about their future when considering taking the training and what effect these concerns had on their taking the training. They also rated these feelings at graduation. Supervisors were also asked how the trainee felt about her future prior to training, at the end of training, and several months later.

All trainees felt the training would have a great effect on their future employability except for three trainees who were confident they could remain employed without additional training (Table 5). At the end of training the ratings remained essentially the same, yet they said that they felt more like working with the public, had more self confidence and were more enthusiastic about their future.

Table 5. Trainee evaluation of effect on training program on her future

Trainees <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Graduates</u>							
Before training	12	17	1	.	2	32	3.2
After training	11	19	2	.	.	32	2.9
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.



Supervisors and county welfare directors who had contact with trainees prior to training said they thought the program would have a very positive effect on the women. They anticipated the training would make them more secure about their future and feel they could be of service to others, help them get off welfare or supplement family income, enlarge their job potential, and help them overcome the feeling that employment was impossible because of their age. Supervisors felt the training achieved these purposes for all trainees except two who did not find full time employment because of health problems. Trainees previously employed as homemakers appeared more secure, professional and self confident after training.

#### Preparation to get and hold a job

A training program designed to develop professionalism should help trainees become better prepared to get and hold jobs. Supervisors and project staff rated each trainee in regard to her suitability for gainful employment before and after training.

The staff rated trainees generally "average" to "fair" (range 5-8) before training but shifted to "excellent" to "good" (range 1-4) after training (Table 6). The fourteen who were rated "fair" and "poor" before training had been unable to keep a job because of alcoholism, lack of previous job training, or were previously unemployed or underemployed. Some who were recently widowed or became head of households found it financially essential to work. Their age, lack of training and low self confidence were barriers to obtaining gainful employment.

The twenty-one who were rated "good" or "average" before training had higher educational attainment, previous job training and successful employment records.

Supervisor ratings of the seventeen trainees they had contact with were comparable to staff ratings. Of the two trainees who were rated as "poor" prior to training and as "average" (5-6) after training, one was unable to obtain employment prior to training because of alcoholism and the other had a negative attitude towards employment.

All trainees, including those supervised and working for an agency, progressed favorably to become better prepared to get and hold jobs by the end of the training in the opinion of staff and supervisors.

Table 6. Staff and supervisor evaluation of effect of training on trainee's preparation to get and hold a job

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	4	17	12	2	35	6.2
After training	14	17	4	.	.	35	2.9
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	2	9	5	1	17	6.1
After training	7	9	1	.	.	17	2.6
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	1	.	4	5.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	6	1	3	4	14	6.2
After training	10	2	2	.	.	14	2.4
After only	.	3	.	.	.	3	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	.	2	1	4	7.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.1

<sup>a</sup> The staff rating is the average of ratings given by the teaching coordinator and project coordinator.  
 The supervisors were a social worker, two welfare directors, or three homemaker supervisors who had sufficient contact with trainees before and after training to make evaluations.  
 Some supervisors had no contact with trainees prior to training, thus could rate "after only". They are enumerated separately not to confound the before-after comparability of data for the other trainees.  
 Two supervisors had supervised four agency homemaker trainees both before and after training. The four trainees are enumerated separately, but are also included under "trainees with supervisors".

<sup>b</sup> See Appendix A for rating scale.

Community understanding

Trainees were also rated by supervisors and staff members in regard to the effect of training on broadening the trainees community understanding or relationships. In their opinion many trainees were not aware, prior to training, of the many community and social services available for families.

Most trainees were rated "average" or lower (Table 7). What concept they did have was often incorrect or biased. Lessons, field trips, field experiences and learning experiences included in the training broadened community understandings and relationships for trainees.

Table 7. Staff and supervisor evaluation of effect of training on trainee's understanding of community relationships

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	3	23	8	1	35	5.9
After training	10	19	5	1	.	35	3.3
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	2	10	3	2	17	6.1
After training	5	10	2	.	.	17	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	3	1	.	4	6.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	5	1	3	3	12	6.2
After training	7	4	1	.	.	12	2.5
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	1	1	1	4	6.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
a.b.							

<sup>a, b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> One supervisor could not rate the trainee who was unemployed both prior to and after training.

By the end of the training program, staff and supervisors rated most of the trainees as having a "good" to "excellent" understanding of community resources that could be of value to families and homemakers. Those who were still rated "average" or "fair" (5-8) were previously unemployed and were reluctant to change biased attitudes formulated before training.

### Job understanding

The career of "homemaker" and homemaker service are relatively new in Kansas. Only within the past two years have 6 of the 105 county welfare offices, 1 county health office, and 1 Visiting Nurses Association established homemaker service within their agencies. The Family Service and Guidance Center in Topeka and four Family and Children's Service agencies in the Kansas City area offer homemaker service, giving a total of only 13 agencies in Kansas and Greater Kansas City, including Missouri.

Job descriptions and expectations for homemakers vary among the agencies providing homemaker service. "Homemaker" is listed as Maid, General under Domestic Service in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, which provides the official job description used by employment service offices.

Before training some trainees had discussed the job description of a homemaker with the homemaker training project coordinator and read in the Question/Answer Sheet an explanation of what a homemaker does. Others received their explanation from homemaker supervisors and from employment service office counselors when they applied for the training. Thus, it is understandable why trainees had different understandings concerning the job description of a homemaker prior to taking the training, and their ratings varied considerably.

The ratings spread throughout the range with a concentration in the middle before training (Table 8). However, after training they concentrated at the higher ratings of 1-4, meaning "excellent" and "good" understanding.

Table 8. Trainee evaluation of job understanding of homemaker

Trainees <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Graduates</u>							
Before training	3	6	14	5	4	32	5.6
After training	23	9	.	.	.	32	2.1
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	4	.	.	4	5.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

The staff and supervisors also evaluated the trainees' understanding of the job description of a homemaker before and after training (Table 9).

Staff members felt that trainees had formed many preconceived ideas as to what a homemaker does from their discussions with supervisors, employment office counselors and publicity they had read prior to training. The ideas of most were unrealistic with the exception of two women who had been employed as homemakers for an agency. The staff rated other trainees as having an "average" to "poor" (5-10) understanding of the job prior to training.

Those supervisors who had explained the job description of homemaker to the trainees prior to their taking the training thought most of the trainees had a fairly good understanding of the job at this time. Other supervisors felt trainees still looked at the job as being a maid or housekeeper before training.

Even though supervisors tended to rate trainee understanding a little higher both before and after training than did staff members, ratings were comparable. The staff rated two trainees "average" and "fair" and supervisors rated one trainee "average" after training. These trainees were previously unemployed, unsure about employment possibilities after training, and anticipated working as a babysitter or housekeeper rather than as a homemaker. All other trainees were rated as having an "excellent" or "good" (1-4) understanding of the job description of a homemaker after training.

The change in ratings shows a consistent pattern of improved understanding of the job of a homemaker as viewed by trainees, staff and supervisors.

Table 9. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's job understanding

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	11	10	12	35	7.3
After training	10	23	1	1	.	35	3.1
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	1	6	4	5	17	6.8
After training	5	11	1	.	.	17	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	2	.	.	4	4.0
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	2	8	3	2	1	16	4.5
After training	10	5	1	.	.	16	2.4
After only	1	.	.	.	.	1	1.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	3	.	1	.	4	4.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

### Status and dignity

Another objective of the training program was to give status and dignity to homemakers as they worked in homes. When asked if they had thought about the status and dignity involved with the job prior to training, twenty trainees said "yes" (Table 10). However, most and especially those not previously employed by an agency, commented that at the time they did not know if the training would give them status and dignity since they were unsure as to what the job involved and where they would be employed after training.

By graduation thirty trainees rated their feelings as "good" and "excellent". Some trainees who were still unsure about employment opportunities anticipated working as a housekeeper or returning to previous

employment as homemakers on their own, which had less status than working as a homemaker for an agency. This improved attitude persisted two to four months after completing the training.

Table 10. Trainee evaluation of status and dignity involved in working as a homemaker

Trainees	Rating of trainees						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Graduates</u>							
Before training	(20 - yes; 12 - no)					32	
End of training	12	18	1	.	1	32	3.0
After training	10	11	1	.	.	22 <sup>a</sup>	2.7
<u>Employed after training</u>							
Before training	16 - yes; 6 - no)					22	
End of training	8	14	.	.	.	22	2.8
After training	10	11	1	.	.	22	2.7
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	(4 - yes)						
End of training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5

<sup>a</sup>See footnote c to Table 3.

The data in Table 10 indicate growth and attitude was as great for those who were later employed as a homemaker as for others.

Those employed on their own after training found the status and dignity they felt towards their work depended on their own attitude and that of their employers. If emphasis were placed on helping families help themselves rather than on performance of household skills, trainees felt the employment had more status and dignity. Trainees felt better about performing household duties if employers treated them on a pre-professional level and saw the value in their training.

Those who found employment with an agency or were previously employed by an agency reported they felt a sense of pride being associated with an agency and being treated on a pre-professional level.

According to supervisor and staff ratings all trainees developed a sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that they were able to render to families as a result of training (Table 11).

Table 11. Staff and supervisor evaluation of sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that trainee is able to render to families

Evaluator <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	10	16	7	1	35	5.3
After training	19	13	2	1	.	35	2.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	5	8	3	1	17	5.5
After training	10	6	1	.	.	17	2.4
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	2	1	.	.	4	3.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	5	4	2	1	12	5.3
After training	12	.	.	.	.	12	1.5
After only	5	.	.	.	.	5	1.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	1	1	1	4	6.5
After training	4	.	.	.	.	4	1.5
a,b See footnotes to Table 6.							

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

The staff rated twenty-six of the trainees from "good" to "average" (3-6) prior to training. Those who were rated "fair" or "poor" prior to training were previously unemployed, lacked self confidence, and did not seem to have a feeling of pride and dignity concerning themselves. The staff felt all trainees had developed this sense of pride and dignity during training, including the three trainees who were still rated as "average" or "fair" after training.

Supervisors also felt the training program helped trainees develop a sense of pride and dignity as indicated in the second part of Table 11. Even trainees previously working with an agency providing homemaker service could relate their feelings of status and dignity to families better as a result of training.



The trainees functioning on-the-job was also rated as to whether they performed in a manner as to bring status and dignity to this service. The ratings of staff and supervisors are in Table 12.

Table 12. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	10	18	5	1	35	5.2
After training	19	12	3	1	.	35	2.7
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	6	9	1	1	17	5.1
After training	8	8	1	.	.	17	2.7
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	2	.	.	4	4.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	6	4	1	1	12	5.0
After training	9	3	.	.	.	12	2.0
After only	.	5	.	.	.	5	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	1	.	1	4	5.5
After training	4	.	.	.	.	4	1.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

The staff ratings shifted from most in the "average" category before training to "excellent" after training. The six who were rated "fair" and "poor" prior to training were untrained for employment, previously unemployed, and lacked self confidence in their ability to work in homes as a homemaker. Staff members felt all trainees except one improved their level of on-the-job performance as a result of training.

This was also true of trainees with supervisors and those with an agency. Supervisor ratings are shown in the last part of the table. Both

felt trainees had to believe in themselves and that homemaking could be a job with status and dignity before they could reflect such feelings to families in their work.

### Personal Development

One objective of the training program was to help women develop personal qualities as described in the definition of a homemaker. Learning experiences were included to enrich the background of trainees, develop insights and desirable attitudes, develop specific skills and abilities and help trainees draw conclusions and summarize important ideas. To assume the role appropriate of a homemaker she must be courteous, friendly and have tact; have good personal habits; and have acceptable attitudes. Homemakers must also have developed sufficient self confidence to work in a variety of situations.

Trainees, staff members and supervisors rated what effect the training program had on the personal development of trainees.

#### Developing self confidence

The trainees, staff and supervisors indicated by their ratings that the training program had a positive effect in helping each trainee develop self confidence to work in homes as a homemaker (Table 13).

The majority of the trainees rated themselves "average" to "fair" (5-8) in self confidence prior to training, but rated themselves "excellent" to "good" (1-4) after training. The nine trainees who felt they lacked self confidence before training were either previously unemployed or had worked as a homemaker on their own. These trainees were also those rated as having "fair" or no (7-10) self confidence by staff and supervisors prior to training. Their ratings reflected the greatest improvement of all trainees.

Of the eight trainees who ranked their self confidence as "fair" prior to training, one ranked her confidence as "average", five as "good", and two as "excellent" after training.

The two trainees who ranked their self confidence as "fair" after training were unsure of employment opportunities. When they obtained gainful employment, their self confidence improved to "excellent" and "good".

Table 13. Trainee, staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's self confidence

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Trainee evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	7	16	8	1	32	5.7
End of training	6	23	1	2	.	32	3.4
After training	13	19	.	.	.	32	2.7
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	3	1	.	4	6.0
End of training	1	2	1	.	.	4	3.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	16	12	5	35	6.7
End of training	6	23	5	1	.	35	3.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	2	7	6	2	17	6.4
End of training	3	12	2	.	.	17	3.4
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	1	.	4	5.5
End of training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	2	3	4	6	2	17	5.9
End of training	10	5	2	.	.	17	2.6
After training	11	5	.	.	1	17	2.6
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	.	.	3	.	4	6.0
End of training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

The one trainee whom the staff rated as "fair" and supervisors rated as "poor" in self confidence after training gained self confidence during the actual training session but was unable to obtain gainful employment for health reasons after graduation. Her self confidence decreased again after training.

Before training, some trainees commented they were "scared at meeting people" and were "unsure how to step into family situations and know what and how to do work effeciently as a homemaker". They needed assurance the methods and techniques they had used in their own home situations were correct. Since many were previously unemployed they had no idea how to handle employer-employee relationships.

Supervisors had observed trainees prior to training had "an inadequate knowledge of her job", "didn't feel knowledgeable in home economics subject matter", "couldn't express herself well in public" and "was leary about being around others".

Training evidently had a positive effect to help trainees to steadily overcome these barriers. Staff members observed that trainees learned to express themselves better, performed household duties with more assurance and became more self confident as the training sessions developed. Self confidence had developed by graduation and continued to develop after training, especially for those who were employed.

Trainees commented, "I never thought I could actually go into such family situations and know how to handle them". Another trainee said, "For the first time in all the years I've worked for others I know I'm using the correct methods and techniques. I can go ahead and do work with assurance it is correct, and work with families instead of just for them".

Trainees, supervisors and staff all rated the self confidence of the majority of the trainees as "average" or "fair" (5-8) prior to training. These ratings improved to "good" (3-4) at the end of training for the majority of the trainees, regardless of their employment status.

#### Enriching background of trainees:

Group living.--Trainees, supervisors, and staff all felt the group living experience had a positive effect on each trainee. Staff thought the group living had an "excellent" or "good" (1-4) effect for all except two trainees (Table 14). Since these two trainees had come with the attitude

they knew how to work and live with others, staff members felt they did not benefit from this experience as much as others did.

Table 14. Staff evaluation of effect of group living on trainees

Resident trainees	Rating of trainees					
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All
All	18	14	2	.	.	34 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>One trainee participated on a non-resident basis.

Trainees commented that the group living experience was "of great value", "very enjoyable", and enriched their background for several reasons. Those who were single or widows had not had to share living arrangements with others for some time. Those who had families considered it both a vacation and a good experience for them and for their families. By living with others, trainees developed a better understanding of themselves in relation to other trainees, especially those from different racial and economic backgrounds. They became more tolerant of other adults' feelings and recognized their own physical limitations.

The group living also allowed more time in evenings for group discussions, friendships to develop and for total involvement in the training program. Several trainees commented they would not have taken the training if it were offered elsewhere than on a college campus. Also they felt if they could have gone home at nights they would have felt a conflict between family and training responsibilities, which was mostly eliminated in group living.

Supervisors believed the group living gave trainees opportunities to share experiences, to be accepted for what they were, and to relate as women among peers. This experience helped trainees learn to work with and understand people, an essential aspect of what they would be doing daily in their work as a homemaker.

Other experiences.--Experiences, besides group living, that trainees listed which added to or enriched their background were: tours to nursing homes to better understand how some elderly and elderly ill are cared for; practical application of menu planning; home nursing and first aid learning

experiences; attending classes on a college campus; and learning to cope with other people and their problems.

### Developing insights and desirable attitudes

Experiences trainees listed most often as helping them develop insights and desirable attitudes were group living and field experiences.

Trainees commented that as a result of group living experiences they "learned to know different types of people", "learned to realize other people have limitations and not to be too critical of others", "had a first opportunity to live with and know people with different racial backgrounds", and "learned to be more considerate of others living in the same situation".

Field experience helped trainees learn that it is important "to become more patient with people", "people really do need help and need a smile", "homemakers must show compassion towards people", "by speaking softly to people homemakers can accomplish a lot", and "working with the elderly and mentally ill requires real understanding".

Over one-third of the trainees stated the training helped them develop more favorable attitudes and a better understanding of people. Trainees did not always approve of situations observed during field experience and the way others lived. However, they felt the training helped make them more aware of various family situations and reasons for people's behavior.

Trainees also felt they became more aware of their own feelings, reactions and personality traits. Several believed the training helped them become more tolerant of others and learn to control their temper. Another trainee commented, "I'm now more aware of problems. Rather than making snap judgments, I now think 'why'".

Staff and supervisors rated trainees' attitudes before and after training (Table 15). Both rated the majority of the trainees in the "average" or "fair" range (5-8) prior to training and in the "excellent" and "good" range (1-4) after training. This was generally true for all trainees, regardless of employment or supervisor status.

Staff and supervisors both recognized that some trainees did not have acceptable attitudes prior to training. However, these trainees improved their attitudes during training. Ratings increased to "average" or above for all except one trainee who was rated by the staff as having a "poor"

attitude prior to training and a "fair" attitude after training. This same trainee was rated as having "fair" and "average" attitudes respectively by her supervisor.

Table 15. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's acceptable attitudes

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Ratings of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	4	21	7	2	1	35	4.1
After training	19	11	4	1	.	35	2.8
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	9	5	.	1	17	4.6
After training	7	8	1	1	.	17	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	3	1	.	.	4	4.0
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	5	3	3	.	12	4.8
After training	9	2	1	.	.	12	2.2
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	1	1	.	4	5.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Supervisors thought the training program, the new knowledge obtained, the relationship between staff and trainees and the group living experiences were effective in helping trainees develop favorable attitudes and insights towards themselves and those with whom they would be working.

The prime value of the course lay in the trainee's changing attitudes towards her own human relations and increased empathy even towards clients of whom she might disapprove.

### Drawing conclusions and summarizing important ideas

Experiences in the training program helped trainees draw conclusions and summarize important ideas. The formalized training program gave trainees ready access to many reference materials and qualified resource personnel. Daily and weekly evaluations completed by each trainee provided an opportunity for them to summarize and rate each day's learning experiences. Weekly and oral evaluation sessions were held with trainees and staff and were tape recorded for future reference. These evaluative measurements are the subject of the teaching coordinator's thesis, presently in preparation.

Trainees stated that the practical application, reference materials, and daily and weekly written and oral evaluations reinforced learning experiences and helped prepare them to work as a homemaker.

Supervisors believed trainees, exposed to new subject matter as a result of training, could see important ideas and could see their implications for people who do not receive proper care.

### Developing other personal qualities

In Tables 16-22 which follow are summarized the staff and supervisor ratings of the effect of the training program on the trainee's personal qualities:

- Table 16. She exercises initiative and judgment on the performance of her duties;
- Table 17. She recognizes the limits of her responsibilities;
- Table 18. She works cooperatively with family members;
- Table 19. She shares observations and problems with those responsible for homemaker service programs;
- Table 20. She assumes the role appropriate of a homemaker;
- Table 21. She is courteous, friendly, and has tact; and
- Table 22. She has good personal habits.

Except for Table 22 staff and supervisor ratings are comparable between all trainee groups, as indicated by the mean scores which are tabulated in the right hand column of each table. In the area of personal development, most trainees were rated in the "good" to "average" range (3-6) prior to training and increased to the "excellent" to "good" range (1-4) as a result of training. This was also true for trainees who had supervisors and those employed as agency homemakers.



Table 16. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's initiative and judgment

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	8	22	4	.	35	5.2
After training	19	13	3	.	.	35	2.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	2	12	2	.	17	5.3
After training	3	12	2	.	.	17	3.4
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	.	3	.	.	4	5.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	4	2	4	1	12	5.5
After training	8	4	.	.	.	12	2.2
After only	.	5	.	.	.	5	4.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	1	1	1	4	6.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 17. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's recognition of limits of her responsibility

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	12	17	4	1	35	5.0
After training	13	19	2	1	.	35	3.0
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	4	10	2	.	17	5.0
After training	5	11	1	.	.	17	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	1	.	4	5.5
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	5	4	2	1	13	5.0
After training	6	7	.	.	.	13	2.6
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	1	.	1	4	5.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 18. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's working cooperatively with family members

cooperatively with family members							
Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	21	11	2	.	35	4.3
After training	22	11	2	.	.	35	2.4
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	9	6	1	.	17	4.3
After training	10	7	.	.	.	17	2.3
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	2	.	.	4	4.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	6	2	4	.	12	5.2
After training	8	4	.	.	.	12	2.2
After only	1	4	.	.	.	5	3.1
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	1	1	.	4	5.0
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 19. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's sharing observations and problems with those responsible

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	18	15	1	.	35	4.4
After training	23	11	1	.	.	35	2.2
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	7	9	.	1	17	5.0
After training	11	6	.	.	.	17	2.2
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	2	.	.	4	4.0
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	6	3	1	.	11	4.2
After training	10	1	.	.	.	11	1.7
After only	.	5	.	.	.	5	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	2	.	.	4	4.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Table 20. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's assuming the role appropriate of a homemaker

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	1	11	19	4	.	35	5.0
After training	19	13	2	1	.	35	2.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	5	10	1	.	17	4.8
After training	8	8	1	.	.	17	2.7
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	2	.	.	4	4.0
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	6	3	3	.	12	5.0
After training	12	.	.	.	.	12	1.5
After only	1	4	.	.	.	5	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	1	1	.	4	5.0
After training	4	.	.	.	.	4	1.5

a,b See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 21. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's courteousness, friendliness and tact

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	4	20	8	2	1	35	4.1
After training	22	9	3	1	.	35	2.5
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	10	5	1	.	17	4.2
After training	10	6	1	.	.	17	2.4
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	2	1	.	.	4	3.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	2	4	3	1	2	12	5.0
After training	8	3	1	.	.	12	2.3
After only	1	4	.	.	.	5	3.1
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	1	1	1	.	4	4.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5

<sup>a, b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 22. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's good personal habits

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	19	8	6	2	.	35	3.0
After training	25	7	2	1	.	35	2.3
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	7	6	3	1	.	17	3.3
After training	12	4	1	.	.	17	2.2
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	1	2	1	.	.	4	3.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	3	6	1	1	2	13	4.4
After training	10	2	1	.	.	13	2.1
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
After training	4	.	.	.	.	4	1.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Although training had some effect on the development of good personal habits, change in this aspect was not as great as in the other areas of personal development in the opinion of the staff who rated the trainees (Table 22). Trainees rated higher in this aspect prior to training. The supervisors, however, did notice an appreciable change, especially among those not previously employed or agency homemakers. Group pressures and group living experiences were incentives for trainees to improve their personal habits.

Through the team work involved at the training center and during field experiences, trainees had an opportunity to exercise initiative and judgment in performing duties, to recognize the limits of their responsibility, work cooperatively with family members, share observations and problems with those responsible for homemaker services, and assume the role appropriate of a homemaker. These experiences also gave staff and supervisors the opportunity to observe trainees and conclude that the training program had a favorable effect on the personal development of nearly all trainees.

Staff observed the type of trainees and each group differed somewhat. The environmental factors were conducive to a cooperative atmosphere. They worked together and unhealthy competition did not develop among the trainees. As problems developed they were discussed as a group and met as a group. This took priority over any other teaching experience scheduled.

Because of limited educational and employment experiences, trainees had not had opportunities to develop understandings of human relationships. Many attitudes were based on preconceived ideas rather than concrete facts and understandings. The training also gave the trainees an opportunity to understand themselves better. Personal development depended on the attitude of each trainee and how much she wanted to benefit from such an educational experience.

#### Subject Matter Achievement

Subject matter included in the training program could be divided into three main areas: working with and understanding people, developing household skills and food for families. Understandings and competencies are essential in each area to be a well qualified homemaker.



Staff and supervisors rated the effect of the training program on trainees in the following areas:

Working with and understanding people:

- Table 23. She understands and uses elementary techniques for working with people; and
- Table 24. She understands some characteristics of families.

Developing proficiency in household skills.

- Table 25. She demonstrates knowledge of basic homemaking techniques;
- Table 26. She practices safe work habits;
- Table 27. She demonstrates proper use of common household appliances; and
- Table 28. She keeps the home clean and orderly.

Planning and preparing food for families

- Table 29. She practices good shopping procedures; and
- Table 30. She plans and prepares nutritious family meals.

Tables 23-30 indicate the positive effect the training had on developing the trainee's subject matter achievement. As in previous ratings trainees were rated in the "good" to "average" range (3-6) by staff and supervisors prior to training and in the "excellent" and "good" range (1-4) after training. Mean scores, shown in the right hand columns of these tables, indicate staff and supervisors rated trainees "average" before training and "good" to "excellent" after training, regardless of employment status or other personal characteristics.

Trainees were rated higher by both staff and supervisors in keeping the home clean and orderly than they were in other areas (Table 28). Most of the trainees were rated "good" prior to training and "excellent" after training in this area, yet this was the area for which the difference in scores before and after was least.

Table 23. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's understanding and use of elementary techniques for working with people

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	6	23	6	.	35	5.5
After training	11	18	5	1	.	35	3.3
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	4	11	2	.	17	5.3
After training	6	8	3	.	.	17	3.2
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	2	.	.	4	4.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	3	4	2	3	13	6.0
After training	4	9	.	.	.	13	2.9
After only	.	3	.	.	.	3	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	.	1	4	6.0
After training	.	4	.	.	.	4	3.5

<sup>a, b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Table 24. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's understanding of some characteristics of families

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	4	23	8	.	35	5.7
After training	7	23	5	.	.	35	3.4
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	1	13	3	.	17	5.7
After training	4	10	3	.	.	17	3.4
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	3	1	.	4	6.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	.	5	3	3	2	13	5.8
After training	8	3	2	.	.	13	2.6
After only	.	3	.	.	.	3	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	1	1	1	4	6.5
After training	1	2	1	.	.	4	3.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Table 25. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's demonstration of knowledge of basic homemaking techniques

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	8	24	2	1	35	5.3
After training	14	19	2	.	.	35	2.8
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	3	13	1	.	17	5.3
After training	5	11	1	.	.	17	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	3	.	.	4	5.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	5	7	.	.	13	4.4
After training	6	7	.	.	.	13	2.6
After only	1	2	.	.	.	3	2.8
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	3	.	.	4	5.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Table 26. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's practicing of safe work habits

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	15	18	2	.	35	4.8
After training	18	15	2	.	.	35	2.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	7	10	.	.	17	5.0
After training	7	9	1	.	.	17	2.8
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	2	.	.	4	4.5
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	2	4	4	1	1	12	4.7
After training	5	7	.	.	.	12	2.7
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	.	1	1	4	6.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0

<sup>a,b</sup>See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup>See footnote c to Table 7.

Table 27. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's demonstration of proper use of common household appliances

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	11	21	3	.	35	5.0
After training	17	17	1	.	.	35	2.6
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	3	12	2	.	17	5.4
After training	5	12	.	.	.	17	2.9
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	3	.	.	4	5.0
After training	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	.	6	4	1	.	11	4.6
After training	2	9	.	.	.	11	3.1
After only	.	3	.	.	.	3	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	.	1	2	.	.	3	4.8
After training	3	.	.	.	.	3	1.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> Three supervisors, one of whom was an agency, could not rate three trainees concerning this question.

Table 28. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's keeping the home clean and orderly

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	3	17	15	.	.	35	4.2
After training	19	16	.	.	.	35	2.4
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	1	7	9	.	.	17	4.4
After training	8	9	.	.	.	17	2.6
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	1	.	4	5.5
After training	.	3	1	.	.	4	4.0
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	2	6	5	.	.	13	4.0
After training	3	9	1	.	.	13	3.2
After only	1	3	.	.	.	4	3.0
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	2	2	.	.	4	4.5
After training	3	1	.	.	.	4	2.0

<sup>a, b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

Table 29. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's practicing good shopping procedures

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean scores
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	3	29	3	.	35	5.5
After training	11	21	3	.	.	35	3.0
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	1	15	1	.	17	5.7
After training	6	10	1	.	.	17	2.9
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	4	.	.	4	5.5
After training	.	4	.	.	.	4	3.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	5	3	2	.	11	3.7
After training	6	5	.	.	.	11	2.4
After only	.	3	.	.	.	3	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	.	.	2	.	.	2	5.5
After training	.	2	.	.	.	2	3.5

<sup>a, b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> Two agency and one non-agency homemaker supervisors could not rate three trainees concerning this question.



Table 30. Staff and supervisor evaluation of trainee's planning and preparation of nutritious family meals

Evaluators <sup>a</sup>	Rating of trainees <sup>b</sup>						Mean score
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	All	
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>							
<u>All trainees</u>							
Before training	.	5	26	3	1	35	5.5
After training	10	22	3	.	.	35	3.1
<u>Trainees with supervisors</u>							
Before training	.	3	12	2	.	17	5.4
After training	5	10	2	.	.	17	3.2
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	1	2	1	.	4	5.5
After training	2	2	.	.	.	4	2.5
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>							
<u>Trainees with supervisors<sup>c</sup></u>							
Before training	1	5	5	1	.	12	4.5
After training	6	6	.	.	.	12	2.5
After only	.	4	.	.	.	4	3.5
<u>Agency homemaker trainees</u>							
Before training	.	.	3	1	.	4	6.0
After training	.	4	.	.	.	4	3.5

<sup>a,b</sup> See footnotes to Table 6.

<sup>c</sup> See footnote c to Table 7.

Even though trainees had previous experiences working with and understanding people, performing household skills and in planning and preparing food, trainees, staff and supervisors believed women could benefit from a training program and learn new subject matter. Many trainees had not had experience caring for or working with handicapped, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill, alcoholic, or low-income persons, or family members of all ages prior to the training program. Thus, they needed to develop understandings and competencies in working with people.

Staff observed that most of the trainees had not planned meals or done comparative shopping prior to training. The training facilities provided an opportunity for these trainees to develop proficiency in performing household skills and in planning and preparing food for families through the team work and group living situation.

The fact that classes were taught by college professors and well qualified resource personnel had a positive effect on all trainees. The three step teaching method of lecture, group discussion or practical application, and evaluation provided reinforced learning experiences.

How much the trainees benefited from lessons, field experience, practical application or other learning experiences during the training depended on their attitude and desire to learn new competencies and understandings.

#### Developing skills

Trainees were also asked at the end of the training what experiences were included in the training to help them develop specific skills and abilities. Their answers are categorized in Table 31.

Reasons given for listing these skills were: trainees "had had no previous training in these areas", "discovered there was a newer and an easier method of performing the task", "had never had the opportunity to learn in this area and then put the information into practical use".

Table 31. Skill each trainee thought she developed most during training

Lesson	Number
<u>Working with and understanding people</u>	<u>10</u>
Home nursing	6
Learning to listen	2
Working with retarded people	1
Working with people	1
<u>Developing proficiency in household skills</u>	<u>11</u>
Time management	6
Cleaning methods	1
Laundry methods	1
Use of appliances	1
Making beds	1
Sewing	1
<u>Planning and preparing food for families</u>	<u>11</u>
Menu planning	6
Shopping	5
<u>All</u>	<u>32</u>

Trainees benefited both from subject matter achievement and from personal development as a result of training (Table 32).

Table 32. Trainee, staff and supervisor evaluation of which had a greater effect on trainees - subject matter achievement or personal development

Evaluator	Personal development	Subject matter	Both	All
<u>Trainee evaluation of:</u>				
All trainees	7	13	7	27 <sup>a</sup>
Agency homemaker trainees	1	3	.	4
<u>Staff evaluation of:</u>				
All trainees	8	11	16	35
Trainees with supervisors	4	3	6	13
Agency homemaker trainees	1	2	1	4
<u>Supervisor evaluation of:</u>				
Trainees with supervisors	6	3	4	13
Agency homemaker trainees	2	.	2	4

<sup>a</sup>Five trainees did not rate one over the other.

In many instances it was difficult to rate one over the other. Several trainees commented that the subject matter learned helped them to become more self confident. Others felt they had to develop their self confidence before they could get across subject matter with families with whom they worked. This accounts for evaluators reporting that trainees benefited in both areas and did not rate one over the other.

Trainees were asked in the follow up interview which lessons they felt were most helpful to them at the end of the training program (Table 33) and which lessons were least helpful (Table 34) and why they felt this way. Their comments are categorized in the tables within three major subject matter areas of the training program.

Table 33. Trainee evaluation of which lessons were most helpful

Lesson	Number
<u>Working with and understanding people</u>	<u>20</u>
Home nursing	14
Working with all ages	5
Working with aged	1
<u>Developing proficiency in household skills</u>	<u>5</u>
Cleaning and laundry	4
Time management	1
<u>Planning and preparing food for families</u>	<u>4</u>
Menu planning	3
Shopping	1
<u>None selected</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>All</u>	<u>32</u>

Twenty trainees felt lessons on working with people were of greatest value to them because they had no previous training in these areas, enjoyed the lessons and instructors and could see immediate practical application of the material.

Reasons given for considering certain lessons to be of least value were: "I've done that for years and knew it all already", "I don't like foods", "the field trip was depressing", and "I won't use it as I won't work with children", and "I had that in extension unit lessons years ago".

Table 34. Trainee evaluation of which lessons were least helpful

<u>Lesson</u>	<u>Number</u>
<u>Working with and understanding people</u>	<u>4</u>
Home nursing	2
Working with small children	1
Field trips to nursing homes	1
<u>Developing proficiency in household skills</u>	<u>12</u>
Cleaning	5
Laundry	3
Sewing	2
Using kitchen appliances	1
Buying fabrics	1
<u>Planning and preparing food for families</u>	<u>3</u>
Menu planning	1
Shopping	1
Cooking	1
<u>None selected</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>All</u>	<u>32</u>

## Summary

Training had a positive effect on trainees in all areas of professional development, personal development and subject matter achievement. Trainees, supervisor and staff ratings all indicated this positive effect.

Trainees within the target age group of 45 to 60 benefited most from such training because they had experienced raising their own families. They also had the most favorable attitudes towards retraining and accepting new methods and ideas.

Race, financial status, marital status and number or ages of dependents had no apparent effect on how much trainees benefited from the training.

Only six trainees were unemployed after training, as compared to sixteen prior to training. The limited number of agencies providing homemaker service and the low wages and poor working conditions offered by private employers limited employment opportunities for many trainees. Trainees who had no previous job training and limited formal education believed the formalized

training program and certification helped them overcome educational barriers to obtain gainful employment.

Those previously unemployed were apprehensive about employment opportunities following graduation, and were especially concerned if their community lacked understanding of the job description of a homemaker.

Prior to training most trainees did not know what salary a homemaker might expect. By the end of training, salary became a predominant consideration for them to work as homemakers.

Trainees and supervisors both felt training had a positive effect on the trainee's future employability, self confidence and security about their future. Graduates were better qualified to get and hold a job.

Training gave broadened understanding of the many community and social services available for families, according to staff and supervisors.

Job descriptions and expectations for homemakers vary both among agencies providing homemaker services and among private employers. Trainees, staff and supervisors believed trainees improved understanding of the job description of a homemaker as a result of training.

The training program developed a sense of status and dignity in the trainee's working as a homemaker, according to trainees, staff and supervisors. Those employed after training found the status and dignity involved with the job depended on their own attitude and that of their employers. Staff and supervisors also believed trainees developed a sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that they were able to render to families as a result of the training, and that trainees reflected such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service.

Group living and field experiences helped trainees develop better understandings, insights and desirable attitudes towards themselves and other trainees, especially those of different racial and economic backgrounds.

The unique feature of this training program of the in-resident group living experience on a college campus enriched trainees' backgrounds.

The structure of the formalized training program, including attending classes taught by college professors and qualified resource personnel and ready access to many reference materials helped trainees draw conclusions and summarize important ideas. The three step teaching method of lecture, group discussion and practical application, and evaluation proved successful.

More trainees thought they benefited from subject matter achievement than from personal development as a result of training. Staff and supervisors believed trainees benefited from both subject matter achievement and personal development.

Lessons on working with and understanding people were most helpful to the majority of the trainees, while lessons in developing household skills were listed as least helpful by trainees at the end of training. However, trainees were evenly divided in stating they had developed understandings and competencies in the areas of working with people, and new and easy methods in performing household skills and in planning and preparing food for families.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Women can and will take advantage of educational opportunities to qualify them to become fully employed homemakers. Improved employment opportunities and salary were the main concerns of the vast majority of the trainees. Training was important for learning how to be of greater service to families and to develop self confidence.

Women who took training were interested in serving others and working with people, but did not want to be considered maids or domestics. Trainees who have developed self confidence and good attitudes were more receptive to working as homemakers and willing to work for families until they could work with families.

Training programs can enrich the trainee's background and help her develop insights and desirable attitudes. Programs can also help them draw conclusions and summarize important ideas. The result is that trainees develop self confidence necessary to work in a variety of situations.

Trainees can benefit both through personal development and subject matter achievement as a result of training. They are more interested in subject matter if they can see its immediate practical application.

Training at a university has a positive effect on trainees, particularly those with limited educational experiences. Classes taught by college professors and well-qualified resource personnel effect the trainees positively.

The three step teaching method of lecture, group discussion or practical application, and evaluation provides reinforced learning experiences. The four week session, including one week of supervised field experience, provided adequate time to include all essential learning experiences trainees need to become qualified to work as homemakers.

In-residence training provides a quality of instruction for the most essential concern of homemakers, that of providing personal care and understanding.



The effect of the training on each trainee depends on her attitudes and willingness to learn and accept new ideas and methods, and how well she relates to those with whom she works. The prime value of the training program lay in changed attitudes of trainees towards their own human relations and increased empathy even towards clients of whom they might disapprove.

Although trainees believed they were qualified to fill the job of a homemaker at graduation, this attitude had to be maintained by upgraded employment with good wages, status and dignity, and employer-employee understanding of the job of a homemaker. The offering of training and awarding a certificate are inadequate unless supportive services and employment follow graduation. Agencies providing homemaker services and homemaker supervisors also must have clear understandings of homemaker qualifications and duties and reflect a pre-professional attitude towards the service.

The evaluation instruments were successful in obtaining discriminable differences between the various stages of training: before training, at graduation and after training. The data are consistent, thus suggesting the instruments' reliability. Since the trainees, the staff and supervisors were in essential agreement in their scoring it would appear also that the instruments are valid. Hence, the instruments can be recommended for future use in other training programs. However, the estimated cost of approximately \$700 for time and expenses to conduct this study should be considered in recommending these evaluative techniques to other programs.

Possibly different results would have been obtained if trainees had been interviewed before training rather than asking them to recall their attitudes after training. However, the number and timing of tests has an effect on the trainees. The objective of obtaining a different or improved evaluation must be considered along with possible effects on trainees and the program.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, Professor and Head, Department of Family Economics, for his encouragement, guidance and constructive criticism during the study and preparation of this manuscript.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Mrs. Marjorie Greenberg and Mr. Richard McAllister, project officers for the United States Department of Labor contract OSMP-82-18-68-31; Mr. Seymour Rubak, project officer for the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, contract OE-O-8-008009-3485(039); and to the National Committee on Household Employment, including Mrs. Margaret Morris, who initiated the project, Mrs. Mary Schlick and Miss Carole Jamison.

Gratitude is also expressed to trainees and homemaker supervisors and project staff for their assistance and cooperation, and to my husband, Jerome, for the encouragement and understanding which made graduate study possible.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Burford, Elizabeth. "A Formalized Homemaker Training Program." Child Welfare League of America Standards for Homemaker Service for Children, 1962, pp. 3-5.
- Doscher, Virginia. Report of the 1964 National Conference on Homemaker Services. Washington, D.C., April 29-May 1, 1964. New York, New York: National Council for Homemaker Services, 1964.
- Greenberg, Suzanne. Letter explaining Training Center for Comprehensive Care, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, August 13, 1968. (Typewritten.)
- Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis. Synopsis of the Final Report on the Project on Homemaker Services for the Chronically Ill and Aged. St. Louis, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- Howell, Grace. "Homemaker Service A Community Resource." Indicators, May 1964, p. xiv.
- Moore, Alverta Magnus. Determination of Need for a Homemaker Service in Riley County, Kansas. Master's Thesis, Department of Family Economics, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1965.
- National Council for Homemaker Services, Inc. Homemaker-Home Health Aides Training Manual. New York, 1967.
- National Council for Homemaker Services, Inc. Standards for Homemaker-Home Health Aide Services. New York, 1965.
- Specian, Rosemarie T. "An Interdisciplinary Approach to Teaching Homemaker Aides." Journal of Home Economics, 61 (May, 1969), 346-349.
- State of Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. Guide for Training Homemakers. Springfield, 1965. (Mimeographed.)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. Federal Extension Service. Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low Income Families. Pubn. No. PA-681. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics. Educational Attainment: March 1966 and 1965. Series P-20, No. 153. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, December 19, 1966.

- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1960 Census of Population. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, p. 18, Kansas. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Bureau of Public Assistance. Homemaker Service in Public Welfare. The North Carolina Experience. North Carolina Department of Social Welfare, 1961. (Mimeographed.)
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Division of Public Health Methods. Homemaker Services in the United States, Report of the 1959 Conference on Homemaker Service. Public Health Service Pubn. No. 746. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. The Visiting Homemaker: A Suggested Training Program. Pubn. No. OE-87002. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Public Health Service. Recommendations for Homemaker/Home Health Aide Training and Services. Public Health Service Pubn. No. 1591. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U.S. Department of Labor News. Office of Information. 7 Projects Will Seek to Upgrade Household Employment. USDL-8609. March 13, 1968.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

## Rating Scale for Interviews and Questionnaires

1      Excellent    "a great effect"

2

3      Good

4

5      Average

6

7      Fair

8

9      Poor    "no effect"

10

APPENDIX B  
Interview Schedule with Trainees

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed training \_\_\_\_\_ Date of interview \_\_\_\_\_

Present status: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed training, not employed as homemaker  
\_\_\_\_\_ Employed as homemaker by agency  
\_\_\_\_\_ Employed as homemaker on own

Now that it has been \_\_\_\_\_ months since you have completed a training session of the Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project, we are interested to know if the training had an effect on you. If it did, was this effect positive or negative? This information will be helpful to us to evaluate the training program and develop a training outline that can be used in other training centers in the future.

Thus, we are interested in three main areas--how you felt before the training program, at the end of the training program, and now after you have been working for several months.

First let's think back before you took the training. One of our concerns is what to tell women before they come to the training.

1. How did you first hear about the Homemaker Training Program?
2. When was that?
3. At the time you heard about the program, what were you doing?
4. Why were you interested in the program?
5. As you remember it, what was discussed during your interview with the employment service office?
6. Was there anything you would have liked to know that was not covered?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes) what was that?

One objective of the program is to upgrade household employment.

7. How about salary--was that discussed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

How did you feel about it?

Specifically, how would you rate this on a 1-10 scale. . . as to what effect did the proposed salary you would earn as a homemaker have on your taking the training?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very great effect									no effect
(sounded very good)									(sounded awful)

8. What about your future? Was this brought up? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

How did you feel about this?

Specifically, what effect did this have on your taking the training?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
great effect									no effect

9. How was the job itself described to you?

How would you rate your understanding of what is a homemaker at that time?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
great understanding									no idea

10. Did you consider the fact that this training would give you status and dignity as you worked in homes? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Would you explain this feeling to me?

11. Did you enter the training program with self confidence that this would be of value to you, or did you wonder if it would all be worth it?

How would you rate your self confidence before the training program?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
extremely confident									no confidence



12. You have been keeping house for some time before you took the training program. Did you think before you came that you would learn any new subject matter in any area? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes) in what area?

13. Does this cover everything on your mind before you took the training session?

---

Now let's discuss how you felt the day you graduated from the actual training program and the training program in general.

14. What did you think of the training while you were taking it?

15. Was it what you expected? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Why or why not?

16. What parts of the training were most helpful?

Why?

What parts of the training were least helpful?

Why?

17. What did you think of the variety of instructors?

Can you think of anyone else that you would like to have had as an instructor? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Who?

Why?

18. What did you think of the three-step teaching procedure of lecture, group discussion or practical application, and evaluation?
19. Was the group living experience of value to you? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
20. Were there any experiences included to add to and enrich your background?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
What were these?
21. Were experiences included to help you develop insights and desirable attitudes? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
What were these?
22. What experiences helped you develop specific skills and abilities?
- 8- 23. What experiences helped you draw conclusions and summarize important ideas?

24. How did you feel about the two weeks of in-resident training, followed by the week of field experience, than a final week of in-resident training?
25. Do you think you would have felt the same way about the training program if you could have come to classes each day and gone home at nights, if this were possible?
26. What were your impressions of the other trainees?

27. Did the training help you develop self confidence?

In what way?

How would you rank your self confidence at the end of the training program?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
,									,
extremely confident									no confidence

28. Did the training program develop status and dignity for you in your work in other people's homes?

How would you rate this on a scale. as to how important the job of a homemaker seemed to you at the end of the training?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
,									,
very important									not important

29. In which way did you benefit more from the training--through personal development or through subject matter achievement?

Why do you feel this way?

30. Did the training influence your attitudes towards people? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

In what way?

31. After the training program, were you clear as to what your duties as a homemaker might be?

32. At the end of the training, what did you think about the salary and working conditions as explained to you in the training program?

Would you rate these feelings on a scale?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
,									,
excellent									very poor

33. At the end of the training, how did you feel about your future?

Would you rate these feelings on a scale?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
,									,
excellent									very poor

34. Was there anything else included in the training session that we have not discussed that has had an effect on you?

It has now been \_\_\_\_\_ months since you completed the training program. You have had time to think about the program--and perhaps change your mind as to how you feel about different things. Now let's discuss these feelings and reactions.

35. Have you been placed on a job as a homemaker? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If yes, how did you get this job?  
 (If no, go to question 48.)

36. Where was the job?

37. Part time \_\_\_\_\_ Full time \_\_\_\_\_

38. What salary do you receive?

How do you feel about this salary?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
excellent									very poor

39. What do you do on your job?

40. How are you supervised?

41. (If she is supervised) How has your supervisor helped you?

42. What is the value of a supervisor?

43. (If no supervisor) Do you wish you had a supervisor?

44. How could she be of value to you?

45. How does your job compare with what you thought you would be doing?



56. How would you rank your feelings of status and dignity towards your work now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very high									very low

57. Now that you have worked for several months, which has been more valuable to you--what you learned in the training program in subject matter or your personal development as a result of the training?

58. Has your idea of what a homemaker is changed in the past several months?

59. Do you have any other comments about the way you feel today about the training program?

What effect it had on you?

Thank you so much for your time and assistance to complete this follow-up evaluation of the training program. We appreciate it.

## APPENDIX C

## Interview Schedule with Supervisor

Name of Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Trainee \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview \_\_\_\_\_

Now that it has been \_\_\_\_\_ months since \_\_\_\_\_ has completed a training session of the Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project, we are interested to know if the training had any effect on the trainee. If it did, was this effect positive or negative? This information will be helpful to us to evaluate the training program and develop a training outline that can be used in other training centers in the future.

Thus, we are interested in three main areas--how the trainee felt before the training program, how she felt at the end of training, and now after she has been working for several months.

First let's think back before she took the training. One of our concerns is what to tell women before they come to the training, and how they feel about the training program at this time.

1. Did you discuss the training program with the trainee before she applied for the training?
2. As you remember it, what was the trainee's reaction to taking the training at that time?
3. Why was she interested in the training?

One objective of the training program is to upgrade household employment--to improve salary, working conditions, and fringe benefits for women.

4. Was this discussed at all with the trainee before she took the training?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ How did she feel about it?

Specifically, how would you rate this on a 1-10 scale. . . as to what effect did the proposed salary she would earn after training have on her taking the training.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

Did this feeling change by the end of the training program? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, how would you rate the feeling at this time?

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

5. Before she took the training, what was her understanding as to what is a homemaker?

How would you rate this understanding from 1-10?

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

Did this understanding change as a result of the training program?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, please rate)

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

6. What about her future? Was this discussed?

How did she feel about this?

Did this feeling change by the end of the training program?

Is it the same today as three months ago?

Personal development is another objective of the training program.

7. How would you rate her self confidence before the training program?

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

How would you rate it at the end of the training program?

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

Has it changed since she has been working?

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

8. Was there anything else you can remember about her attitude or reaction before she took the training.

Now let's discuss the actual training program, and what effect this had on the trainee.

9. Did the three-step procedure of lecture, practical application or group discussion, and evaluation have an effect on the trainee?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Why do you say that?



10. Was the group living experience of value to her? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
11. Can you think of any experiences included in the training which added to or enriched her background?
12. Were there any experiences included to help her develop insights and desirable attitudes? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
13. What experiences helped her develop specific skills and abilities?
14. What experiences helped her draw conclusions and summarize important ideas?
15. What effect do you feel the two weeks of residential training, followed by the week of field experience, than a final week of residential training had on the trainee?
16. Do you think she would have felt the same way about the training program if she would have come to classes during each day and gone home at nights, if this were possible?
17. In which way do you feel the trainee benefited more from training--- through personal development or through subject matter achievement?  
  
Why do you feel this way?
18. Was there anything else included in the training program that had an effect on the trainee?

The third area we are interested in is the \_\_\_\_\_ months since the training program.

19. Now that she has worked for several months, which has been more valuable to her--what she learned in the training program through subject matter or her personal development?

20. Has her idea of what a homemaker is changed in the past several months?

21. Do you have any other comments as to the effect of the training program on the trainee?

Rate each question 1-10 the degree to which you feel the homemaker being rated meets each standard (according to the rating scale you have before you.)

The first group of questions concern the trainee's achievement in subject matter. There are five main areas of subject matter included in the training program. Would you rate the trainee as she was before the training and now?

#### Working with and Understanding People

22. She understands and uses elementary techniques for working with people.

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

23. She understands some characteristics of families

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

#### Household Skills

24. She demonstrates knowledge of basic homemaking techniques

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

25. She practices safe work habits (improves the safety of the home)

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

26. She demonstrates proper use of common household appliances

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

27. She keeps the home clean and orderly

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### Food for Families

28. She practices good shopping procedures

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

29. She plans and prepares nutritious family meals

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

### Professional Development

30. She became better prepared to get and hold a job

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

31. She has broadened community understanding or relationship

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

32. Do you have any more comments concerning the effect of the training program on the achievement of the trainee?

Now let's discuss the effect of the training program on the personal qualities of the trainee.

33. She exercises initiative and judgment on the performance of her duties

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

34. She recognizes the limits of her responsibility

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

35. She works cooperatively with family members

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

36. She shares her observations and problems with those responsible for the homemaker services program

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

37. She assumes the role appropriate of a homemaker

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

38. She is courteous, friendly, and has tact

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

39. She has good personal habits

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

40. She has acceptable attitudes

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

#### Upgrading Household Employment

41. She has developed a sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that she is able to render to families

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

42. She has reflected such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service.

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

43. Do you have any other comments concerning the personal development of the trainee?

## APPENDIX D

## Interview Schedule with Client

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Homemaker's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Dates homemaker worked for you \_\_\_\_\_

- 
1. Why did you employ \_\_\_\_\_?
  2. How did you meet her?
  3. Did you know she had the Homemaker Training Program when you hired her?
  4. Did this have any effect on your hiring her?
  5. Had you heard of the Homemaker Training Program before you met her?
  6. What duties does she do?
  7. Who decided what she would do while on the job?
  8. Were there any duties you wanted done that she would not do?
  9. What hours does she work?
  10. How about salary--how did you decide what you would pay her?
  11. Would you tell me what you do pay her?  
How do you feel about paying her this salary?
  12. Does she get any fringe benefits (meals, transportation, etc)?
  13. Has she discussed the training program with you?

14. What does she say about it?

15. What effect do you think the training program had on her?

Would you please rank each of the following questions 1-10 as to the degree to which you feel the homemaker meets each of the following standards (according to the rating scale you have before you).

The first group of questions concern the homemaker's achievement in subject matter. There are five main areas of subject matter included in the training program. Would you rank the homemaker in each area?

#### Working with and Understanding People

16. She understands and uses elementary techniques for working with people  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

17. She understands some characteristics of families  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

#### Household Skills

18. She demonstrates knowledge of basic homemaking techniques  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

19. She practices safe work habits (improved the safety of the home)  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

20. She demonstrates proper use of common household appliances  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

21. She keeps the home clean and orderly  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

#### Food for Families

22. She practices good shopping procedures  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

23. She plans and prepares nutritious family meals  
now    1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9        10

24. Do you have any other comments concerning her knowledge of subject matter she should know to work as a homemaker?

Now let's discuss the effect of the training program on the personal qualities of the homemaker.

25. She exercises initiative and judgment on the performance of her duties

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

26. She recognizes the limits of her responsibility

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

27. She works cooperatively with family members

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

28. She shares her observations and problems with those responsible for her employment

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

29. In your opinion, she assumes the role appropriate of a homemaker

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

30. She is courteous, friendly, and has tact

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

31. She has good personal habits

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

32. She has acceptable attitudes

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Upgrading Household Employment

33. She has developed a sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that she is able to render to families

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

34. She has reflected such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service.

now 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

35. Do you have any other comments concerning the personal development of the homemaker?

## APPENDIX E

Staff Evaluation of Effect of the  
Training Program on the Trainee

Name of Trainee \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Staff Member \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Evaluation \_\_\_\_\_

Rate each question 1-10 the degree to which you feel the homemaker being rated meets each standard (according to the rating scale).

1. Before she took the training, what was her understanding as to what is a homemaker?

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

Did this understanding change as a result of the training program?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, rate)

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

2. How would you rate the trainee's self confidence?

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. How would you rate her attitude towards working as a homemaker?

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. Was there anything else you can remember about her attitude or reactions at the beginning of the training?

5. What effect did the training program have on the trainee?

Was the group living experience of value to her? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

6. Did the three step procedure of lecture, demonstration or practical application and evaluation have an effect on the trainee? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, rate)

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10



7. Can you think of any experiences included in the training which added to or enriched her background?
8. Were there any experiences included to help her develop insights and desirable attitudes? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
9. What experiences helped her develop specific skills and abilities?
10. What experiences helped her draw conclusions and summarize important ideas?
11. In which way did you feel the trainee benefited more from the training - through personal development or through subject matter achievement?
- Why do you feel this way?
12. Was there anything else included in the training program that had an effect on the trainee?

The first group of questions concern the trainee's achievement in subject matter. There are five main areas of subject matter in the training program. Rate the trainee as she was before and after the training.

Working with and understanding people

13. She understands and uses elementary techniques for working with people.

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

14. She understands some characteristics of families.

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Household skills

15. She demonstrates knowledge of basic homemaking techniques

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

16. She practices safe work habits (improved the safety of the home).

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

17. She demonstrates proper use of common household appliances

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

18. She keeps the home clean and orderly

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Food for families

19. She practices good shopping procedures

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

20. She plans and prepares nutritious family meals

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Professional development

21. She became better prepared to get and hold a job

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

22. She has broadened community understanding or relationship

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

23. Do you have any more comments concerning the effect of the training on the achievement of the trainee?

Now let's discuss the effect of the training program on the personal qualities of the trainee.

24. She exercises initiative and judgment on the performance of her duties

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

25. She recognizes the limits of her responsibility

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

26. She works cooperatively with family members

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

27. She shares her observations and problems with those responsible for the homemaker service program

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

28. She assumes the role appropriate of a homemaker

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

29. She is courteous, friendly and has tact,

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

30. She has good personal habits

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

31. She has acceptable attitudes

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Upgrading household employment

32. She has developed a sense of pride and dignity about homemaker service that she is able to render to families

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

33. She has reflected such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service

before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
after	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

34. Do you have any other comments concerning the personal development of the trainee?

## APPENDIX F

Table 34. Profile of trainees by training sessions

	Training Session							All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Age (years)</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Under 35	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1
35-45	.	1	1	1	.	.	.	3
45-60	2	4	5	6	3	1	.	21
Over 60	.	.	.	2	1	2	5	10
<u>Race</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Caucasian	1	2	6	8	3	3	5	28
Negro	1	3	.	1	1	.	1	7
<u>Previous education</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Under 8th	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
8	.	1	2	2	1	.	2	8
9	.	.	.	3	.	1	.	4
10	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
11	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1
12	2	3	4	4	1	2	3	19
College	.	.	.	.	2	.	1	3
<u>Previous job training</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17</u>
Vocational school	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Telephone company	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1
Beauty college	.	2	.	.	.	1 <sup>a</sup>	1	4
Nurses training	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1
Nurses aide	.	.	.	2	.	.	2	4
Psychiatric aide	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	2
Practical nurse	.	.	.	1	.	1 <sup>a</sup>	.	2
Real estate	.	.	.	.	.	1 <sup>a</sup>	.	1
Friendly Visitors	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	2

<sup>a</sup>One trainee had both beauty school and real estate training.

Table 34. Continued.

	Training Session							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	All
<u>Marital status</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Married	1	2	2	6	.	2	2	15
Single	.	1	.	1	.	.	1	3
Widowed	.	1	4	1	3	1	2	12
Divorced	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	2
Separated	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	3
<u>Dependents</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
None	1	3	6	7	4	2	3	26
1	.	1	.	1	.	.	3	5
2	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1
3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
4 or more	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	3
<u>Age of dependents</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21</u>
Under 1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
1-5	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	2
6-10	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	2
11-15	1	2	.	3	.	.	1	7
16-21	3	1	.	2	.	2	2	10
<u>Head of household</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Yes	1	3	4	3	4	1	4	20
No	1	2	2	6	.	2	2	15
<u>Financial situation</u>								
<u>prior to training</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35</u>
Self supporting	.	3	4 <sup>a</sup>	3	4	1	4	19 <sup>a</sup>
Main wage earner	1	1	1 <sup>a</sup>	1	.	.	.	3 <sup>a</sup>
Supplementing family income	1	1	1	5	.	2	2	12
Dependent on welfare	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Partially on welfare	.	.	2 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	(2 <sup>a</sup> )

<sup>a</sup> Even though one trainee in Session 3 was self supporting and another was the main wage earner, they received medical assistance from welfare.

Who is a homemaker?

A person trained in the skills of managing a home, capable of assisting a family or an individual in periods of stress and crises to maintain the home and its activities.

Who will use a homemaker?

Families and individuals in need of services as a result of illness, childbirth, an accident (emergency or out-of-town trip), disablement of a family member, infirmities of old-age. Any of these conditions may create a need for a homemaker.

Is housekeeper the same as homemaker?

No. A housekeeper is concerned with sweeping, dusting, cleaning and custodial care of the house. A homemaker is concerned with all the aspects of the home, including personal care of the family members.

## THE TRAINING PROGRAM

How long will the training program be?

The present plan includes a four-week training program. It will begin with two weeks of residential training, that is, living in a home management house on K-State campus with seven other women trainees. They will prepare their own meals in this "family setting," take care of the house, receive instruction through lecture, discussion, demonstration, and seeing films, while enjoying the fellowship of living together. During the third week, the trainees will actually work in homes where their skills are needed. They will return the fourth week for additional training.

What will the course include?

The course will include reading, demonstrations, and actual performing of learning experiences shared with others. The subjects will include infant and child care, personal care, accident prevention, working with children, home nursing, understanding needs of the elderly, dealing with death, meal planning, buying, and money management.

Do I have to be a high school graduate?

No. This program is designed primarily for training persons of good will and ability, but who may not have had much formal education. In fact, the training is for women over 35 and preferably 45 years of age and over, who can benefit from training and can serve in their community helping those in need. No such formal training now exists. The purpose of this program is to give status and dignity to homemaker service. A certificate is awarded upon completion of the training program.

If I can't leave home for four weeks, can I take the training some other way?

No. This is a program designed for those who usually can leave home. Ordinarily, those who cannot leave home for the training would likewise not be able to leave home to work. Emergencies in the families often come at times which do not meet the convenient hours of 8:00 to 5:00.

Where will I be employed?

As in any field of employment, the trainee is a free agent to accept a position wherever available. It is anticipated, however, that the majority of the trained homemakers will find placement as a civil service employee of a social welfare department. A member of their staff will place the homemaker into situations where she is best able to serve. Normally this work would be full-time employment.

What salary can I expect to receive?

The salary will depend on where you are employed. For example, under Kansas Civil Service classification No. 7618, the salary ranges from \$280 per month to a maximum of \$395. All applicants for training will file at the Kansas Employment Service Office serving their home community.

If I work for the welfare agency, will I work only in homes supported by the public assistance?

No. The homemaker service is too valuable and too important to be denied to those not on public assistance. It will be available to all members of the community on a fee-service basis, depending on the family's ability to pay.

Will the homemaker serve as a nurse to a convalescent?

No. The homemaker cannot replace the services of a nurse. However, the homemaker may make it possible for an individual to leave the hospital a few days earlier than otherwise, for she will care for the household needs and assist in the home. The physician may encourage patients to leave the hospital knowing they will have good care at home. He will insist that any medical treatment be handled by the medical profession.

When will future training sessions begin?

September 30, October 28, December 2, 1968, and January 20, 1969



## APPLY NOW

Who is eligible for training?

Any woman over 35 and preferably 45 and over who indicates and gives assurance that she expects to work in a full-time capacity as a homemaker.

How much will the training cost?

The program is designed so that any eligible woman can obtain the training at no personal cost. The training grants for those eligible for the MDTA allowances are available. Inquire of the Employment Service Office serving your county for the actual amount. If you are on welfare, ask about the benefits available.

Who is eligible for a training grant?

If you are unemployed or underemployed, have a total of one year employment in your lifetime, and are head of a household (or your husband is unemployed), you may be eligible under the Manpower Development Training Act and should contact the local office of the Kansas State Employment Service. If you are on welfare, you are eligible for benefits in addition to your regular welfare payments. If you are now employed and your employer wishes you to have this training, a portion of your living costs will be met.

How will applicants be selected?

Applications will be reviewed by the State Homemaker Service Advisory Board who will judge applicants on the basis of their (1) potential for future service, (2) trainability, (3) moral character and reliability, (4) enthusiasm and interest, (5) recommendation of community leaders, and (6) physical fitness and vigor. All applications will be judged equally, regardless of race, color, or national origin.

How do I make application?

Write: Homemaker Service Demonstration Project  
Department of Family Economics  
Justin Hall  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Register: Your local office, Kansas State Employment Service

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project is one of seven national pilot programs of the National Committee on Household Employment, a non-profit organization to develop, promote and elevate the status of household related services.

A distinct feature of this project is its training of women particularly age 45 and older. Another feature is in the in-residence training. As the project progresses, it is expected that a type of training will be developed which will be adaptable to other training centers. Furthermore, it is hoped the trainees will reflect such a high level of on-the-job performance as to bring status and dignity to this service.

An overriding objective of this project is to encourage communities to recognize this as a service which offers a new career for women, giving them new opportunities to use their talents gainfully, and thereby serve the needs of others.

This is a one-year project receiving financial support from the United States Department of Labor and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

## ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Miss Tessie Agan  
Mrs. Dorothy Bradley  
Mrs. Orville Burtis  
Mr. Oliver E. Ebel  
Mr. Homer Floyd  
Mrs. Loudell Frazier  
Mr. B. G. Gustafson  
Miss Elizabeth Hirschler  
Mrs. Francis Lanning  
Mrs. Selma Maybell  
Mrs. Nancy Moylan  
Mr. Dennis Popp  
Miss Elfriede Regier  
Mr. Ivan Sand  
Mrs. Mariella Smith  
Mr. Jack Southwick  
Mrs. George H. Westerhaus  
Mrs. Shirley White

Kansas Home Economics Association  
Child Welfare Service, S. C. S. W.  
Riley Co. Council of Social Agencies  
Kansas Medical Association  
Kansas Civil Rights Commission  
Services for the Aging, S. D. S. W.  
MDTA coordinator, Kans. Employment Serv.  
State Board of Vocational Education  
First Congregational Church U. C. C.  
Marion Co. Welfare Director  
Catholic Family & Community Service  
Div. of Inst. Mgt., S. D. S. W.  
Home Health Agency, Kansas Bd. of Health  
Riley County Commissioner  
Homemaker Service S. D. S. W.  
North Central Kansas Guidance Center  
Harvey Co. Welfare Director  
Ext. Home Economist, Coop Ext. Service

## HOMEMAKER SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Provides four weeks of training to learn about--

## FOOD FOR FAMILIES

...nutrition...budgeting the food dollar...menu planning...guided tour of supermarkets

## FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

...basic human needs...infants...pre-school children...adolescents...aged  
...mentally ill...retarded persons...alcoholics...low-income families

## FABRIC CARE

...fabric selection...care of different kinds of fabrics...shopping for children's clothing...mending

## CLEANING

...care of floors and furniture...using supplies and equipment

## LAUNDRY

...supplies and equipment...methods

## HOME NURSING

...Red Cross certificate

## BUDGETING AND COMPARATIVE SHOPPING

...brands...prices...quality...advertising...packaging

## MANAGEMENT IN THE KITCHEN

...use of equipment...cleaning supplies...sanitation in food handling

## ACCIDENT PREVENTION AND FIRST AID

## PERSONAL CARE AND DEVELOPMENT

## TIME AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT

## HOW TO USE THE COMMUNITY'S SOCIAL AGENCIES TO HELP FAMILIES

## HOW TO GET A JOB AS A HOMEMAKER

Through--

...lectures...films...group discussions...role playing...reading assignments...evaluations  
...three weeks in-resident experience and one week of field experience  
...field trips to Federation for Handicapped Children's Nursery, Headstart Project and nursing homes

## WRITE:

Kansas State University  
Dept. of Family Economics  
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Telephone 532-6204

HOMEMAKER SERVICE DEMONSTRATION TRAINING PROJECT  
COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

by

MURIEL ELAINE ZIMIERMAN  
B. S., McPherson College, 1964

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

This study is concerned with the comprehensive evaluation portion of the experimental and demonstration Homemaker Service Demonstration Training Project, conducted at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. Thirty five women were trained in seven training sessions to develop skills and competencies needed for gainful employment as homemakers.

The specific objective of this study was to determine the effects of the training on the professional development, personal development and subject matter achievement of the trainee, as observed by the trainees, trainers, supervisors and employers. A secondary objective was to evaluate the evaluation instruments.

To determine these effects of training on trainees, both objective measurements (a profile of trainees) and subjective measurements (interview schedules and rating scales) were used. A profile of the trainees was developed to determine their background and characteristics. Interview schedules were used to obtain information through recall and observation concerning trainees before training, at the end of training, and two to four months after training from trainees, from those in a supervisory capacity and from project staff members.

Factors that had an effect on the professional development of trainees included their attitudes and reactions regarding the salary they would receive as a homemaker, the effect the training would have on their personal lives, their understanding of the job of a homemaker, their preparation to get and hold a job, their understanding of community relationships, and the status and dignity of the profession.

The training program helped trainees in the area of personal development to develop self confidence, develop insights and desirable attitudes, draw conclusions and summarize important ideas and develop better understandings of themselves and others. The effect the training had on each trainee depended on her attitude and willingness to learn and to accept new ideas and methods, and how well she related with those with whom she worked.

Subject matter achievement included understandings and competencies in the areas of working with and understanding people, developing proficiency in household skills, and planning and preparing food for families. Staff and supervisors believed trainees benefited from both subject matter achievement and personal development.

The formalized three step teaching procedure of lecture, group discussion or practical application, and evaluation helped trainees develop skills and understandings essential for homemakers. Classes were taught by college professors and qualified resource personnel.

The training program's unique feature of the in-resident group living experience on a college campus enriched trainees' background and provided opportunities for a variety of learning experiences.

The evaluation instruments were successful in obtaining discriminable differences between various stages of training: before training, at graduation and after training. The data are consistent, thus suggesting the instruments' reliability. Since the trainees, the staff and supervisors were in essential agreement in their scoring it would appear also that the instruments are valid. Hence, the instruments can be recommended for future use in other training programs.

Results indicated women can benefit from formalized training programs and find gainful employment as homemakers. The use of evaluative instruments from initial stages of training can be incorporated successfully for an objective determination of whether training programs meet their objectives.